

A New Approach to μ - B_μ

Csaba Csáki,¹ Adam Falkowski,² Yasunori Nomura,^{3,4} and Tomer Volansky⁵

¹*Institute for High Energy Phenomenology, Newman Laboratory of
Elementary Particle Physics, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA*

²*CERN, Theory Division, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland*

³*Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

⁴*Theoretical Physics Group, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

⁵*School of Natural Sciences, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ 08540*

We present a new approach to the μ - B_μ problem of gauge mediated supersymmetry breaking. Rather than reducing the generically large contribution to B_μ we point out that acceptable electroweak symmetry breaking can be achieved with $\mu^2 \ll B_\mu$ if at the same time $B_\mu \ll m_{H_d}^2$. This hierarchy can easily appear in models where the Higgs fields are directly coupled to the supersymmetry breaking sector. Such models can yield novel electroweak symmetry breaking vacua, can deal with the supersymmetric flavor and CP problems, allow for gauge coupling unification, and result in distinct phenomenological predictions for the spectrum of superparticles.

Introduction. Supersymmetry (SUSY) is a very attractive candidate for explaining the stability of the weak scale against radiative corrections. However, it suffers from nagging problems such as the SUSY flavor problem, the SUSY CP problem, and the μ problem. The SUSY flavor problem points toward gauge mediated SUSY breaking (GMSB) [1]. However, GMSB itself suffers from the variant of the μ problem called the μ - B_μ problem [2]. The problem lies in the fact that generic GMSB models predict the relation $B_\mu \approx 16\pi^2\mu^2 \gg \mu^2$ which prevents electroweak symmetry breaking (EWSB) if the soft masses in the Higgs sector are of the same order as μ . Typically, solving the μ - B_μ problem is achieved by introducing some additional dynamics that ensures $B_\mu \lesssim \mu^2$ (see e.g. [2, 3, 4]).

In this letter we propose a new approach to the μ - B_μ problem. We point out that the GMSB relation $B_\mu \gg \mu^2$ does not pose any problem if we allow the other mass parameters in the Higgs sector to also display a hierarchy. In particular, we argue that the pattern

$$\mu^2 \sim m_{H_u}^2 \ll B_\mu \ll m_{H_d}^2, \quad (1)$$

leads to viable EWSB. We show that this hierarchical pattern with the down-type Higgs soft mass dominating over B_μ can be naturally obtained in GMSB models where the Higgs multiplets are directly coupled to the SUSY breaking sector. Finally, we argue that the pattern in Eq. (1) leads to interesting novel phenomenology. Many more details of this scenario will be discussed in [5].

The μ - B_μ problem. Let us begin by reviewing the μ - B_μ problem of GMSB. The tree level equations for the Higgs vacuum expectation values are given by

$$\frac{m_Z^2}{2} = -|\mu|^2 - \frac{m_{H_u}^2 \tan^2 \beta - m_{H_d}^2}{\tan^2 \beta - 1}, \quad (2)$$

$$\sin 2\beta = \frac{2B_\mu}{2|\mu|^2 + m_{H_u}^2 + m_{H_d}^2}. \quad (3)$$

Here we adopt the convention $B_\mu > 0$. The first of these equations represents a problematic aspect of the minimal

supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) known as the μ problem: the SUSY preserving parameter μ is required to be related to the SUSY breaking masses and, in the absence of fine-tuning, both should be of the order of the weak scale. A solution to the problem can arise if μ is generated in conjunction with SUSY breaking. In the limit of $\mu = 0$, the MSSM has an enhanced Peccei-Quinn (PQ) symmetry. If SUSY breaking leads to the breaking of this (accidental) symmetry, a μ parameter of the correct magnitude can be generated. While this idea can be elegantly realized in the context of gravity mediation [6], it encounters a problem in the framework of GMSB [2]. In order to dynamically generate μ of order the SUSY breaking masses in GMSB, the PQ symmetry must be broken by coupling the Higgs fields directly to the SUSY breaking sector. Such couplings, however, typically generate both μ and B_μ at one loop, leading to the relation $B_\mu \approx 16\pi^2\mu^2 \gg \mu^2$. This is said to be problematic for the following reason. If $m_{H_u}^2 \sim m_{H_d}^2 \sim \mu^2$, as suggested naively by Eq. (2), then Eq. (3) cannot be satisfied with $B_\mu \gg \mu^2$. If, on the other hand, $m_{H_u}^2 \sim m_{H_d}^2 \sim B_\mu$, significant fine-tuning is needed to satisfy Eq. (2), since the experimental constraint of $\mu \gtrsim m_Z$ then requires $m_{H_u}^2, m_{H_d}^2, B_\mu$ to be much larger than m_Z^2 . This is the notorious μ - B_μ problem, which is considered to be one of the most serious problems of GMSB.

Basic proposal. The common lore is that a solution to the μ - B_μ problem must reduce the hierarchy between μ and B_μ . A close inspection of Eqs. (2, 3) reveals, however, that this is not necessary. To have a solution to Eq. (3), it is sufficient that $2B_\mu < m_{H_u}^2 + m_{H_d}^2 + 2|\mu|^2$. This suggests a completely different approach to the μ - B_μ problem: we can keep the generic GMSB relation $B_\mu \gg \mu^2$ and, at the same time, generate the hierarchy $m_{H_d}^2 \gg B_\mu$ together with $m_{H_u}^2 \sim \mu^2$.

To be more specific, let us consider the following simple pattern of the mass parameters in the Higgs sector:

$$\mu \approx \epsilon \Lambda_H, \quad B_\mu \approx \epsilon \Lambda_H^2, \quad m_{H_u}^2 \approx \epsilon^2 \Lambda_H^2, \quad m_{H_d}^2 \approx \Lambda_H^2, \quad (4)$$

where $\epsilon \ll 1$ and Λ_H is the effective SUSY breaking scale in the Higgs sector. It is easy to see that the pattern of Eq. (4) leads to a correct EWSB vacuum. The EWSB stability condition $2|\mu|^2 + m_{H_u}^2 + m_{H_d}^2 > 2B_\mu$ is satisfied for $m_{H_d}^2 > 0$, since $m_{H_d}^2$ is parametrically larger than B_μ . Consequently, Eq. (3) can be solved with

$$\tan \beta \approx \frac{m_{H_d}^2}{B_\mu} \approx \frac{1}{\epsilon}. \quad (5)$$

The condition for EWSB is $B_\mu^2 > (|\mu|^2 + m_{H_u}^2)(|\mu|^2 + m_{H_d}^2)$. In a typical SUSY breaking scenario, this condition is fulfilled as a result of renormalization group evolution making $m_{H_u}^2$ negative. While this could also happen in our scenario, it is not necessary. Since $B_\mu^2 \approx \mu^2 m_{H_d}^2 \approx m_{H_u}^2 m_{H_d}^2$, both sides of the above inequality are parametrically of the same order of magnitude, and therefore the condition can be satisfied with positive $m_{H_u}^2$. The negative radiative corrections from top-stop loops are of course still present, but they do not have to be dominant. EWSB is then driven by the dynamics that generate the boundary conditions, Eq. (4), rather than by the renormalization group (RG) evolution of the MSSM (see also [7] for a related idea).

Let us now look at the vacuum equation (2). The three contributions to the right-hand-side (RHS) are all of the same order $\mu^2 \approx m_{H_u}^2 \approx m_{H_d}^2 / \tan^2 \beta \approx \epsilon^2 \Lambda_H^2$. This suggests that the pattern of Eq. (4) could potentially lead to a “fully natural” EWSB: if $\epsilon^2 \Lambda_H^2 \approx m_Z^2$ the electroweak symmetry can be broken without any fine-tuning. Unfortunately, a careful analysis shows that the situation is not that simple, and we still likely need some amount of cancellations in the RHS of Eq. (2) in realistic parameter regions. The reason is that satisfying the LEP II bound on the Higgs boson mass requires a rather heavy stop, $m_{\tilde{t}} \gtrsim 1$ TeV, which then feeds in as a large one-loop contribution of order $(500 \text{ GeV})^2$ to $m_{H_u}^2$. One should be aware of the fact that if this “irreducible” fine-tuning is not eliminated there is no compelling motivation to consider the “fully natural” pattern of Eq. (4). Instead, one can consider more general scenarios for the Higgs mass parameters which still lead to realistic EWSB without improving but not worsening the fine-tuning. In fact, theories discussed below can also lead to such a generalization of Eq. (4).

The “irreducible” fine-tuning described above may be ameliorated if we go beyond the MSSM with simple GMSB soft terms. Improving the situation requires extra contributions to the Higgs quartic coupling and/or to the scalar trilinear couplings. Such contributions may appear due to direct couplings of the Higgs fields to the SUSY breaking sector, or with the aid of extra singlet fields. The possibility of raising $m_{H_d}^2$ with $B_\mu \approx \mu^2$ was considered in the context of NMSSM-type models in [4].

Realization. Our approach to the μ - B_μ problem requires some dynamics that naturally generates the pattern of Eq. (4) or its variants. Moreover, a natural theory

should relate the scale Λ_H to that for the gaugino, squark and slepton masses. In the following we explain how to achieve these by coupling the MSSM Higgs fields directly to the SUSY breaking sector.

First, recall general features for the soft gaugino masses M_a and scalar masses m_I^2 in the GMSB framework. Below we define our parameters at the scale M where SUSY breaking effects are mediated to the MSSM sector. In perturbative gauge mediation, M corresponds to the mass scale for the messenger fields. Unless there is a special structure in the SUSY breaking sector (e.g. an approximate R symmetry), the soft masses take the form:

$$M_a \approx g_a^2 \frac{N}{16\pi^2} \Lambda, \quad m_I^2 \approx \sum_{a=1,2,3} \frac{g_a^4 C_I^a}{8\pi^2} \frac{N}{16\pi^2} \Lambda^2. \quad (6)$$

Here, g_a are the MSSM gauge couplings evaluated at M , and C_I^a are the quadratic Casimir coefficients. The quantity N measures the number of SUSY breaking sector fields charged under the MSSM gauge group, and Λ is the effective SUSY breaking scale. In perturbative gauge mediation, Λ is the SUSY breaking mass squared splitting divided by the SUSY mass for the messenger fields, F/M . Note that, in general, there can be $\mathcal{O}(1)$ coefficients in the RHSs of Eq. (6). For general expressions for M_a and m_I^2 in GMSB, see [8].

In order to generate μ and B_μ , we consider the superpotential couplings of the Higgs fields $H_{u,d}$ to operators $\mathcal{O}_{u,d}$ in the SUSY breaking sector

$$\mathcal{L} = \int d^2\theta (\lambda_u H_u \mathcal{O}_u + \lambda_d H_d \mathcal{O}_d) + \text{h.c.} \quad (7)$$

Here, $\lambda_{u,d}$ are the renormalized couplings at the scale M . By rescaling the operators $\mathcal{O}_{u,d}$ we can always make the couplings $\lambda_{u,d}$ dimensionless, and we adopt this convention below. Note that our discussion here applies to a very large class of theories – the SUSY breaking sector can be strongly or weakly coupled, can contain single or multiple scales, and can lead to direct or indirect mediation of SUSY breaking.

After including the interactions in Eq. (7), the mass parameters in the Higgs sector receive a direct contribution from the SUSY breaking sector. Assuming that the SUSY breaking sector does not have a special structure (such as an approximate PQ symmetry), the contribution is given by

$$\mu \approx \lambda_u \lambda_d \frac{N_H}{16\pi^2} \Lambda_H, \quad B_\mu \approx \lambda_u \lambda_d \frac{N_H}{16\pi^2} \Lambda_H^2, \quad (8)$$

$$m_{H_{u,d}}^2 \approx \lambda_{u,d}^2 \frac{N_H}{16\pi^2} \Lambda_H^2, \quad A_{H_{u,d}} \approx \lambda_{u,d}^2 \frac{N_H}{16\pi^2} \Lambda_H, \quad (9)$$

where N_H is the effective number of messenger fields coupled to $H_{u,d}$ in Eq. (7). When the SUSY breaking sector is perturbative, Λ_H is F/M of these fields, and the sign

of $m_{H_d}^2$ is, as required, positive in the simplest models (in which $\mathcal{O}_{u,d}$ are bilinears of messenger fields having generic M 's and F 's). Generically, we expect $N \approx N_H$ and $\Lambda \approx \Lambda_H$, although they can easily differ by model dependent $O(1)$ coefficients. Note that m_{H_u, H_d}^2 also receive the contribution of Eq. (6), so that their values are given by the sum of Eqs. (6) and (9). Since the superparticle masses should not be much larger than a TeV to address the gauge hierarchy problem, the scales Λ and Λ_H are determined as

$$\Lambda \approx \Lambda_H \approx O(10 - 100) \text{ TeV}. \quad (10)$$

For $\lambda_{u,d} \approx O(1)$, Eqs. (8, 9) give $B_\mu \sim m_{H_{u,d}}^2 \gg \mu^2$. This pattern has two problems. One is that Eq. (3) does not allow a solution with sufficiently large $\tan \beta$, and the other is that the hierarchy between $m_{H_u}^2$ and μ^2 leads to fine-tuning of $O(N_H/16\pi^2)$ or larger. The first problem can be addressed by making λ_u smaller, leading to $m_{H_u}^2 \ll B_\mu \ll m_{H_d}^2$, while the second problem by making λ_d and/or N_H larger, reducing the hierarchy between $m_{H_u}^2$ and μ^2 . Note that the last two terms appearing in the RHS of Eq. (2), $m_{H_u}^2$ and $m_{H_d}^2/\tan^2 \beta$, are always of the same order regardless of the values of $\lambda_{u,d}$. Our proposal thus is to take

$$\lambda_u \ll \lambda_d. \quad (11)$$

The simplest pattern of Eq. (4) corresponds to taking $\lambda_d \approx 4\pi/\sqrt{N_H}$, the largest possible value, with $\epsilon \equiv \lambda_u \sqrt{N_H}/4\pi$. The value of λ_d , however, need not be this large. As stressed before, without eliminating the “irreducible” top-stop fine-tuning, there is little point in increasing λ_d in order to reach the “fully natural” pattern of Eq. (4).

There are several constraints on how large we can make λ_d at M . First of all, to have a very large value of λ_d , the SUSY breaking sector must be strongly coupled; otherwise λ_d hits the Landau pole just above M . Large λ_d also strongly violates any parity invariance associated with hypercharge conjugation, leading to a possibility of introducing a too large Fayet-Iliopoulos (FI) contribution to m_I^2 at M . Finally, large λ_d implies large $m_{H_d}^2$, so that depending on the value of $\tan \beta$, it may lead to a tachyonic sbottom or stau. These issues, however, are model dependent, and they can be addressed in explicit models with the outcome that λ_d can in general take any value up to $\approx 4\pi/\sqrt{N_H}$ [5].

Several mechanisms can produce the hierarchy of Eq. (11). Since the hierarchy is not required to be larger than, say $O(10)$, perhaps the simplest possibility is to assume that it arises as an accidental hierarchy of dimensionless numbers. Alternatively, a dynamical realization can be found by assuming that the SUSY breaking sector is strongly coupled and approximately conformal over a range of scales above M . In such a case, $\lambda_{u,d}$ are power-law sensitive to the anomalous dimensions of the

operators $\mathcal{O}_{u,d}$, and a large hierarchy can naturally arise due to a small difference of these anomalous dimensions. This scenario has a dual realization in 5D AdS space. In that picture, the MSSM matter fields are localized on the UV brane, while the gauge and Higgs fields live in the 5D bulk and can directly couple to the SUSY breaking sector localized on the IR brane [9]. The hierarchy between λ_u and λ_d can then be explained by different localization of H_u and H_d in the 5th dimension.

Flavor and CP . Before moving to phenomenology, let us shortly comment on the SUSY flavor and CP problems. Since in our framework the SUSY breaking parameters are generated by gauge mediation and the direct Higgs couplings, they are automatically flavor universal at the scale M . The SUSY flavor problem is solved, provided that low energy radiative corrections do not induce large flavor violation. One might worry that such corrections are present in our case, since $m_{H_d}^2$ and $\tan \beta$ are enhanced by powers of $\lambda_d/\lambda_u \gg 1$. Through the RG equations, the large $m_{H_d}^2$ feeds in to the squark masses leading to $(m_Q^2)_{ij} \simeq \frac{1}{2}(m_D^2)_{ij}^\dagger \simeq -\frac{(y_d^\dagger y_d)_{ij}}{8\pi^2} m_{H_d}^2 \ln \frac{M}{m_{H_d}}$. However, in the SUSY field basis where $(y_{u,d})_{ij}$ are diagonal, the enhanced contribution to non-diagonal squark masses appears only in the mass-squared matrix of the left-handed up-type squarks. It then follows that only nontrivial mass insertion parameters generated are $(\delta_{LL}^u)_{ij}$. Since the experimental constraints on these mass insertion parameters are rather weak, $(\delta_{LL}^u)_{12} \lesssim (10^{-2}-10^{-1})$, they do not lead to appreciable constraints on the theory.

We now consider the SUSY CP problem. Suppose that the operator $\mathcal{O}_u$ ($\mathcal{O}_d$) in Eq. (7) consists of a single term, so that there is only a single coupling λ_u (λ_d). In this case, the phases of $\lambda_{u,d}$ can be completely absorbed into the phases of H_u, H_d, Q and L . Therefore, if the SUSY breaking sector preserves CP , all the parameters generated, $M_a, m_I^2, \mu, B_\mu, A_{H_u, H_d}$ are real in the basis where $\lambda_{u,d}$ are real, solving the SUSY CP problem. Since it is fairly simple to construct SUSY breaking models that preserve CP , we find this solution very attractive. Note that in general CP invariance in the SUSY breaking sector is not enough to solve the SUSY CP problem; for example, the mechanism of [6] does not solve the problem even if the SUSY breaking sector preserves CP . Here the structure of the couplings in Eq. (7) automatically leads to a solution to the SUSY CP problem as long as the SUSY breaking sector does not violate CP .

Basic phenomenology. The most distinct phenomenological consequences of our framework follow from the fact that $m_{H_d}^2$ dominates all other soft terms. First of all, the mass of the CP -odd neutral Higgs, $m_{A^0}^2 = 2|\mu|^2 + m_{H_u}^2 + m_{H_d}^2$, is much larger than the weak scale and is likely beyond the reach of the LHC. Thus, the Higgs sector phenomenology corresponds to a special case of the so-called “decoupling limit” of the MSSM [10]. For the scalar sector, we effectively see a one-Higgs dou-

blet model at the weak scale. On the other hand, the Higgsinos are relatively light since their masses are set by μ . Small μ implies a fairly light chargino, and in the case $\mu < M_1$, the lightest neutralino is Higgsino-like.

The hierarchy $m_{H_u}^2 \ll m_{H_d}^2$ has also an important impact, via RG evolution, on the sfermion mass spectrum. The large value of $m_{H_d}^2$ will have the unusual effect of turning on a sizable FI D -term for $U(1)_Y$, which leads to new contributions in the low energy superparticle spectra

$$\delta m_I^2 \simeq Y_I \frac{3g_1^2}{40\pi^2} m_{H_d}^2 \ln \frac{M}{m_{H_d}}, \quad (12)$$

where Y_I represents the hypercharge. In particular, the usual GMSB sum rules $\text{Tr} Y m^2 = \text{Tr}(B - L) m^2 = 0$ (with the trace running over one generation) are not satisfied; the traces are not even RG invariant. Still, the relation $\text{Tr} Y m^2 - \frac{5}{4} \text{Tr}(B - L) m^2 = 0$ predicted in general GMSB [8] is approximately RG invariant for the first two generations and does not receive a correction from the FI term. It then follows that the sum rule $6m_Q^2 + 3m_U^2 - 9m_D^2 - 6m_L^2 + m_E^2 = 0$ is obeyed, while the traditional sum rule is modified to $\text{Tr} Y m^2 \simeq \frac{g_1^2}{4\pi^2} m_{H_d}^2 \ln \frac{M}{m_{H_d}}$. Once the detailed superparticle spectrum is known, the violation of this sum rule could point to large $m_{H_d}^2$, which may provide another hint that our scenario is realized.

For the third generation, the largeness of $m_{H_d}^2$ and $\tan\beta$ may significantly affect the RG evolution. In particular, the left-handed squark $\tilde{q}_3$ and the right-handed sbottom $\tilde{b}$ receive the correction

$$m_{\tilde{q}_3}^2 \simeq \frac{1}{2} m_{\tilde{b}}^2 \simeq \frac{y_b^2}{8\pi^2} (m_{H_d}^2 + |A_{H_d}|^2) \ln \frac{M}{m_{H_d}}, \quad (13)$$

and similarly for the left-handed slepton $\tilde{l}_3$ and the right-handed stau $\tilde{\tau}$ with $y_b \rightarrow y_\tau$. In fact, for given values for the other parameters, this provides an upper bound on $\tan\beta$ from the experimental bounds on the masses of these particles, because $y_{b,\tau} \simeq (m_{b,\tau}/v) \tan\beta$.

Examples. In order to illustrate the features of low energy spectra, we have generated several example spectra using **SuSpect** [11], and double-checked their consistency with **SOFTSUSY** [12]. When studying GMSB spectra one needs to take into account the fact that GMSB models are often more constrained experimentally than generic MSSM models, due to the characteristic $2\gamma + \bar{E}_T$ signature arising from the next-to-lightest SUSY particle (NLSP) decaying into the gravitino, $\tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow \tilde{G} + \gamma$. Tevatron searches for this final state set an upper bound on the total cross section involving superparticle production, which can imply bounds as strong as $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} \geq 126$ GeV for the neutralino and $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm} \geq 231$ GeV for the chargino for a particular GMSB point [13]. More generally, this can be turned into a bound on the μ - M_1 plane, as has been recently shown in [14], which applies as long as the NLSP decays within the detector (which would generically be

the case for low scale SUSY breaking as considered in this letter).

Four explicit example spectra are presented in Table I. The first example point (M1) is the most conservative: it uses minimal GMSB with very heavy stops (over 1.4 TeV), where the Higgs boson is sufficiently heavy without any extra source for the Higgs quartic coupling. In this case, there is still a significant (“irreducible”) fine-tuning arising from the top-stop contribution to $m_{H_u}^2$. The second example (M2) has a somewhat lighter stop (of order 1 TeV), with the gaugino and sfermion masses still following the pattern of minimal GMSB. The fine-tuning due to the top-stop contribution is reduced, but one may need to have a small extra contribution to the Higgs quartic coupling. In the last two examples, we deviate from minimal GMSB, and “squash” the sfermion spectrum by assuming different F/M values for the triplet and doublet messengers, using the notation $\Lambda_3 = (F/M)_3$, $\Lambda_2 = (F/M)_2$, and $\Lambda_1 = \sqrt{(2/5)\Lambda_3^2 + (3/5)\Lambda_2^2}$. In this case the stop mass is lowered to around 400 GeV, and the fine-tuning associated with the ordinary little hierarchy problem is strongly softened (the fine-tuning in this point is of order $\approx 10\%$). However, since the top-stop contribution to the Higgs mass is now reduced, a sizable extra contribution to the Higgs quartic coupling must be present. In all four cases, $m_{H_u}^2$ is positive at the weak scale (although one can find examples where it is negative), μ is small, and m_{A^0} (which is roughly equal to m_{H_d}) is much larger than TeV. The presented examples should be considered as a proof of principle that our approach to the μ - B_μ problem can be consistently realized.

Summary. We have shown that it is *not* necessary to reduce B_μ in GMSB models. Successful EWSB can be obtained with the hierarchy of Eq. (1), which can naturally arise if the Higgs fields are directly coupled to the SUSY breaking sector. EWSB can be achieved without turning $m_{H_u}^2$ negative. This solution elegantly addresses the μ - B_μ problem of GMSB, without reintroducing the SUSY flavor problem. The SUSY CP problem can also be addressed. Specific phenomenological predictions include a decoupled second Higgs doublet, relatively light Higgsinos, large violation of the traditional mass sum rule, and large corrections to the sbottom and stau masses. The scenario studied in this letter can be applied to large classes of GMSB models, and is consistent with gauge coupling unification if the couplings $\lambda_{u,d}$ are not too large or are asymptotically free. We will further elaborate on various issues associated with the present scenario in the upcoming paper [5].

Acknowledgments. We thank K. Agashe, N. Arkani-Hamed, R. Dermisek, Z. Komargodski, P. Meade, M. Papucci, M. Reece, D. Shih, P. Slavich, S. Su, and S. Thomas for useful discussions and to J. L. Kneur for sending us a new version of **SuSpect**. C.C., A.F. and T.V. thank the KITP at Santa Barbara and C.C., Y.N. and T.V. thank the Aspen Center for Physics for their

	Λ	Λ_H	λ_u	λ_d	$\tan\beta$	$m_{H_u}^2$	μ	m_{h^0}	m_{A^0}	$m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$	$m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^+}$	$m_{\tilde{t}_1}$	$m_{\tilde{t}_2}$	$m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$
M1	60	18	0.50	2.80	8.01	$(521)^2$	160	115	4030	150	159	1360	1520	353
M2	40	20	0.28	2.08	10.13	$(302)^2$	196	113	3330	164	188	923	1040	192
M3	19	45	10	0.58	3.05	$(483)^2$	221	101	2520	167	209	431	607	256
M4	19	50	10	0.27	3.93	$(356)^2$	182	105	3160	155	176	432	632	293

TABLE I: Four sample spectra illustrating the features of our approach to the μ - B_μ problem, obtained using **SuSpect**. The first 5 columns define the input parameters. At the scale M , which we take to be twice the largest of Λ and Λ_H , the gaugino and scalar masses are given by Eq. (6), while $m_{H_{u,d}}^2$ and $A_{H_{u,d}}$ also receive contributions from Eq. (9) with the coefficients $+1$ (we set $N = 4$, $N_H = 1$ in all cases). For the M3 and M4 points we use the separate triplet and doublet scales Λ_3 (left) and Λ_2 (right) as described in the text. The μ and B_μ parameters are computed from $\tan\beta$ and the electroweak scale v using the EWSB condition, whose values at M are consistent with Eq. (8) up to an $O(1)$ factor. The remaining 9 columns are sample output parameters; $m_{H_u}^2$ and μ represent their values at the weak scale. Note that the spectrum is invariant under the rescaling of the input parameters $\lambda_{u,d} \rightarrow \lambda_{u,d}/\alpha$, $N_H \rightarrow \alpha^2 N_H$.

hospitality. The work of C.C. is supported in part by the NSF under grant PHY-0355005 and by a US-Israeli BSF grant. A.F. is partially supported by the European Community Contract MRTN-CT-2004-503369. The work of Y.N. is supported in part by the NSF under grant PHY-0555661, by a DOE OJI award, and by the Alfred P. Sloan Research Foundation. The work of T.V. is supported in part by the DOE grant DE-FG02-90ER40542.

-
- [1] M. Dine and W. Fischler, Phys. Lett. B **110**, 227 (1982); Nucl. Phys. B **204**, 346 (1982); L. Alvarez-Gaumé, M. Claudson and M. B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. B **207**, 96 (1982); S. Dimopoulos and S. Raby, Nucl. Phys. B **219**, 479 (1983); M. Dine, A. E. Nelson and Y. Shirman, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 1362 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9408384]; M. Dine, A. E. Nelson, Y. Nir and Y. Shirman, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 2658 (1996) [arXiv:hep-ph/9507378]; for a review and further references see G. F. Giudice and R. Rattazzi, Phys. Rept. **322**, 419 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9801271].
 - [2] G. Dvali, G. F. Giudice and A. Pomarol, Nucl. Phys. B **478**, 31 (1996) [arXiv:hep-ph/9603238].
 - [3] P. Langacker, N. Polonsky and J. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 115005 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9905252]; L. J. Hall, Y. Nomura and A. Pierce, Phys. Lett. B **538**, 359 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0204062]; T. S. Roy and M. Schmaltz,

- Phys. Rev. D **77**, 095008 (2008) [arXiv:0708.3593 [hep-ph]]; H. Murayama, Y. Nomura and D. Poland, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 015005 (2008) [arXiv:0709.0775 [hep-ph]]; G. F. Giudice, H. D. Kim and R. Rattazzi, Phys. Lett. B **660**, 545 (2008) [arXiv:0711.4448 [hep-ph]]; T. Liu and C. E. M. Wagner, JHEP **0806**, 073 (2008) [arXiv:0803.2895 [hep-ph]].
- [4] M. Dine, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **62**, 276 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9707413].
- [5] C. Csáki, A. Falkowski, Y. Nomura and T. Volansky, to appear.
- [6] G. F. Giudice and A. Masiero, Phys. Lett. B **206**, 480 (1988).
- [7] Y. Nomura, D. Poland and B. Tweedie, Phys. Lett. B **633**, 573 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0509244].
- [8] P. Meade, N. Seiberg and D. Shih, arXiv:0801.3278 [hep-ph].
- [9] Y. Nomura, arXiv:hep-ph/0410348, and references therein.
- [10] J. F. Gunion and H. E. Haber, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 075019 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0207010].
- [11] A. Djouadi, J. L. Kneur and G. Moultaka, Comput. Phys. Commun. **176**, 426 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0211331].
- [12] B. C. Allanach, Comput. Phys. Commun. **143**, 305 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0104145].
- [13] V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], arXiv:0710.3946 [hep-ex].
- [14] P. Meade, M. Reece and D. Shih, to appear; talk by M. Reece http://online.itp.ucsb.edu/online/lhc_c08/reece/.